

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 are presently active in this case, Claims 19-24 having been added by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the disclosure was objected to as including an informality at page 14, line 6. The Title was objected to as not being sufficiently descriptive. Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 2, 5-8 and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Kubo et al. (Kubo), U.S. Patent 6,195,140. However, Claims 9-13 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and Claims 3 and 4 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to be in independent form.

In response to the objection to the specification, the informality identified has been corrected herewith.

In response to the objection to the title, a new title more descriptive of the claimed invention has been submitted herewith.

Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because in Applicants' view the meaning and scope of the features "first common electrode" and "second common electrode" are clear when considered in light of the corresponding disclosure in the specification at page 8, lines 17-21 and page 14, line 25 to page 15, line 4. Indeed, these portions of the specification make clear that the language in question may encompass one common electrode having two different regions and two different common electrodes. In view of this disclosure, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is traversed. If the Examiner

disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned who will be happy to work with the Examiner in a joint effort to derive mutually satisfactory claim language.

As is evident from the above amendment to the claims, new Claims 19-24 have been added. Claims 19, 21 and 23 find support in Applicants' disclosure shown in Figures 5 and 6 which illustrate a reflecting region 51, which corresponds to the first area, and a reflecting-transmitting region 52, which corresponds to the second area, the reflecting-transmitting region 52 being larger than the reflecting region 51. New Claims 20, 22 and 24 likewise find support in Applicants' disclosure shown in Figures 5 and 6 which illustrate the reflecting region 51 and the reflecting-transmitting region 52 constitute a display region, which corresponds to a third area. Also, the reflecting region 51 is disposed between the reflecting-transmitting region 52 and one side of the display region, and extends along the side of the display region. Accordingly, in view of the noted support in Applicants' original disclosure, it is respectfully submitted that newly submitted Claims 19-24 do not raise a question of new matter.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter. However, since Applicants consider that the rejected claims patentably distinguish over the applied prior art, for the reasons as next discussed, no substantive or claim amendments to the original claims have been made by the present amendment.

Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding rejection based on the Kubo reference because Applicants' claimed invention is believed to clearly distinguish over Kubo. In particular, in the LCD disclosed in Figure 2 of Kubo, the metal film 23 is provided on the transparent conductive film 21. Thus, the metal film 23 and the transparent conductive film 21 are formed on the same area. In view of this structure disclosed in Kubo, it is respectfully submitted that Kubo clearly does not suggest a structure stated in Claims 1 and 14 in regard to "first pixels arrayed on a first area within a surface of the first substrate facing the second

substrate [and] second pixels arrayed on a second area within the surface of the first substrate facing the second substrate, the second area being different from the first area." In light of this difference, it is respectfully submitted that Kubo in no way suggests or renders obvious the claimed invention and that the outstanding grounds for rejection based on Kubo are traversed.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in view of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are definite and patentably distinguishing over the applied prior art. Claims 1-24 are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.


Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

22850

Telephone: (703) 413-3000
Facsimile: (703) 413-2220
EHK:mlh

I:\ATTY\EHK\AMEND-RESPONSES\0039\218106US-AM.DOC